



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/730,647	12/08/2003	Tsz Simon Cheng	BOC9-2003-0054 (425)	2979
40987 7590 07/09/2010 Novak Druce + Quigg LLP CityPlace Tower, 525 Okeechobee Blvd. Fifteenth-Floor WEST PALM BEACH, FL 33401				
EXAMINER MUHEBBULLAH, SAJEDA				
ART UNIT 2174		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 07/09/2010		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

wpbdocket@novakdruce.com
sarah.scott@novakdruce.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/730,647

Applicant(s)

CHENG ET AL.

Examiner

SAJEDA MUHEBBULLAH

Art Unit

2174

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 March 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 8-11 and 29-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 8-11 and 29-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB-08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to Amendment filed on 03/29/2010.
2. Claims 1-3, 8-11, and 29-36 are pending in this application. This action is made Final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-3, 29-31 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Neill et al. ("O'Neill", US 6,219,653), Janes et al. ("Janes", US 6,642,946), Beaudet et al. ("Beaudet", US 5,491,795), Thompson (US 5,761,429) and Hutchings (US 5,940,813).

As per claim 1, O'Neill teaches a computer-implemented method of displaying e-commerce partners within an e-commerce system including an e-commerce application and a commerce graphical user interface (col.6, lines 54-56; col.6, line 67-col.7, line 2), the e-commerce application enabling an e-commerce entity to conduct business with e-commerce partners via a communicatively linked network (col.6, lines 40-48), the method comprising the steps of:

for each of the e-commerce partners automatically determining by an active engine of the e-commerce application whether said e-commerce partner is an active partner based on at least one predetermined criteria, wherein determining whether said e-commerce partner is an active

partner (col.16, lines 35-45) comprises at least one of the following steps, each step being based on a corresponding criterion:

- detecting whether a transaction has occurred with said e-commerce partner within a designated time period,

- determining whether transactions involving said e-commerce partner exceed a designated valuation threshold,

- determining whether a transaction involving said e-commerce partner exceeds a designated data size, and

- determining whether said e-commerce partner has a preference level above a designated preference level (col.8, lines 37-38; col.10, line 63-col.11, line 9; col.11, lines 45-53),

- wherein the corresponding criteria for determining whether an e-commerce partner is an active partner are adjustable (col.11, lines 45-53; col.16, lines 35-45);

- presenting a list of active e-commerce partners within the commerce graphical user interface (Fig.9, col.21, lines 53-67),

However, O'Neill does not teach presenting a partner as an expandable node, when the partner node is expanded, presenting at least one transaction node as a child node of said expanded partner node, wherein each transaction node represents an e-commerce transaction between the e-commerce entity and said e-commerce partner; visually differentiating different types of transaction nodes and different categories of partner nodes, wherein error transaction nodes are highlighted and automatically expanded responsive to an error detection and assigning by a transaction router of the e-commerce application responsible personnel to transactions based

on predetermined rules wherein the predetermined rules are adjustable, and wherein most qualified personnel is assigned to most profitable transactions.

Janes teaches a method of displaying business transactions wherein partner nodes are presented as expandable nodes presenting at least one transaction node as a child node wherein each node represents an e-commerce transaction between an entity and an e-commerce partner (Janes; Fig.2G, *Vendor 2 expanded presents transaction 901*). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to include Janes' teaching with O'Neill's method in order to display transactions in an organized fashion.

Furthermore, the method of O'Neill and Janes does not teach visually differentiating different types of transaction nodes and different categories of partner nodes, wherein error transaction nodes are highlighted and automatically expanded responsive to an error detection and assigning by a transaction router of the e-commerce application responsible personnel to transactions based on predetermined rules wherein the predetermined rules are adjustable, and wherein most qualified personnel is assigned to most profitable transactions.

Beaudet teaches a method of visually differentiating nodes of the same type and different categories (Beaudet, Fig.4, col.4, lines 37-46). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include Beaudet's teaching with the method of O'Neill and Janes in order to visualize the different transactions.

Furthermore, the method of O'Neill, Janes, and Beaudet does not teach wherein error transaction nodes are highlighted and automatically expanded responsive to an error detection and assigning by a transaction router of the e-commerce application responsible personnel to

transactions based on predetermined rules wherein the predetermined rules are adjustable, and wherein most qualified personnel is assigned to most profitable transactions.

Thompson teaches a communications network for monitoring the status of a network via a hierarchical structure wherein error nodes are highlighted (Thompson, col.24, lines 61-65) and automatically expanded responsive to an error detection (Thompson, col.25, lines 7-9). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include Thompson's teaching with the method of O'Neill, Janes, and Beaudet in order to notify the user of any errors.

Furthermore, the method of O'Neill, Janes, Beaudet, and Thompson does not teach assigning by a transaction router of the e-commerce application responsible personnel to transactions based on predetermined rules wherein the predetermined rules are adjustable, and wherein most qualified personnel is assigned to most profitable transactions.

Hutchings teaches a method of processing transactions wherein responsible personnel are assigned to the particular transaction by a transaction router based on predetermined types (Hutchings, col.7, lines 17-18; col.9, lines 30-43; col.10, lines 30-43). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include Hutchings' teaching with the method of O'Neill, Janes, Beaudet, and Thompson in order to streamline issues to the appropriate expertise to handle the issue faster and more effectively.

As per claim 2, O'Neill teaches the method wherein said e-commerce partners include at least one trading partner (col.5, lines 57-65).

As per claim 3, O'Neill teaches the method further comprising the step of: providing a business partner gateway, wherein said commerce graphical user interface is an interface for interacting with said business partner gateway (col.15, lines 42-64).

Claims 29-31 are similar in scope to claims 1-3 respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 36 is similar in scope to claim 1, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

5. Claims 8 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Neill et al. ("O'Neill", US 6,219,653), Janes et al. ("Janes", US 6,642,946), Beaudet et al. ("Beaudet", US 5,491,795), Thompson (US 5,761,429) and Hutchings (US 5,940,813) in view of Fulton et al. ("Fulton", US 6,182,052).

As per claim 8, the method of O'Neill, Janes, Beaudet, Thompson, and Hutchings teaches detection and indication of errors within a GUI (Thompson, col.24, lines 7-9). However, the method of O'Neill, Janes, Beaudet, Thompson, and Hutchings does not teach detection of an EDI transmission error. Fulton teaches the method further comprising the step of: detecting an electronic data interchange (EDI) transmission error; and indicating within said graphical user interface that an error occurred during an associated transmission (Fulton, col.5, lines 63-67; col.14, lines 19-21). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include Fulton's teaching with the method of O'Neill, Janes, Beaudet, Thompson, and Hutchings in order to further display EDI errors.

Claim 32 is similar in scope to claim 8, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

6. Claims 9-11 and 33-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Neill et al. ("O'Neill", US 6,219,653), Janes et al. ("Janes", US 6,642,946), Beaudet et al. ("Beaudet", US 5,491,795), Thompson (US 5,761,429) and Hutchings (US 5,940,813) in view of Stewart et al. ("Stewart", US 7,051,072).

As per claim 9, the method of O'Neill, Janes, Beaudet, Thompson, and Hutchings teaches the method comprising the step of receiving a selection specifying a node of said graphical user interface (Janes, col.9, lines 29-30). However, the method of O'Neill, Janes, Beaudet, Thompson, and Hutchings does not teach the step of responsively establishing a communication session between a user of said commerce graphical user interface and the e-commerce partner associated with said node. Stewart teaches a method of establishing real-time communication sessions between partners (Stewart, col.12, lines 48-57). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include Stewart's teaching with the method of O'Neill, Janes, Beaudet, Thompson, and Hutchings in order to interact with partners in real-time.

As per claim 10, Stewart teaches the method of claim 9, wherein said communication session is an instant messaging session (Stewart, col.12, lines 48-57).

As per claim 11, Stewart teaches the method of claim 9, wherein said establishing step further comprises the steps of: selecting a communication channel and establishing said communication session through said communication channel (Stewart, col.12, lines 48-57).

Claims 33-35 are similar in scope to claims 9-11 respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed 3/29/2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argued the following:

a) O'Neill does not disclose that the status (active or inactive) of the trading partners should be determined based on the preferences.

b) O'Neill does not disclose listing only active e-commerce partners.

The Examiner disagrees for the following reasons:

Per a) O'Neill clearly discloses preferences being made by the trading clients (buyer/seller) which is used in determining whether or not a particular client may trade with another client. Each client must specify whom they prefer to trade with (col.11, lines 45-53).

Per b) O'Neill clearly teaches listing only the current trading partners. Alternatively if a client wishes to activate additional partners then they may do so via an Add button to list those that are not currently trading partners (col.21, lines 53-67)

Communications

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sajeda Muhebbullah whose telephone number is (571) 272-4065. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday/Wednesday and alt. Mondays from 8:00 am to 4:30 pm (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dennis Chow, can be reached on (571) 272-7767.

The central fax number for the organization where correspondence for this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Sajeda Muhebbullah
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2174
/S. M./

Art Unit: 2174

/DENNIS-DOON CHOW/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2174